



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,430	09/24/2003	Mikko Makela	915-007.048	5958
4955 7590 08/10/2007 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			EXAMINER THERIAULT, STEVEN B	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,430

Applicant(s)

MAKELA, MIKKO

Examiner

Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 12-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 12-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/07,06/07.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 05/08/2007.

This action is made Final.

2. Claims 1, 5-10, 12-44 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 21, 23, 26, 34, and 40 are the independent claims. Applicant is advised that a new examiner has been assigned to the case.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The computer readable medium recited in claims 21,22,30,and 39 is not explicitly defined within the specification and lacks antecedent basis in the specification” *so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description*”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 5-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21-28, 30-32, 34-37, 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects-~~(11-1.6)~~, comprising: combining at least two navigation objects ~~(1-1.1-6)~~ into one combined navigation object-~~(4-)~~, wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects, and wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object, presenting said combined navigation object-

~~(4-)~~, and presenting said at least two navigation objects ~~(1-1..1-6)~~, if said combined navigation object ~~(4-)~~ is selected (Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon. Hyperlinks are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14).

With respect to **dependent claim 5**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said combined navigation object ~~(4-)~~ is presented in a first display mode, and wherein said at least two navigation objects ~~(1-1..1-6)~~ are displayed in a second display mode, if said combined navigation object ~~(4-)~~ is selected (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67). Kanevsky teaches the icons can be in one or more objects are shown in the icon. The Icon can be shown in the mode where the users history deems where and when the icon is displayed (first mode). Another interpretation of Kanevsky teaches that the Icons can be combined and shown in a web page. The user can select one part of the Icon and then the second part is shown in a reduced state or as and ICON with the selected information displayed (Second mode).

With respect to **dependent claim 6**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein each of said at least two navigation objects ~~(1-1..1-6)~~ is associated with one respective target object that is displayed or executed upon selection of said respective navigation objects ~~(1-1..1-6)~~ (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 7**, Kanevsky teaches the method ~~wherein said combined navigation object (4) is presented in a first display mode, wherein said at least two navigation objects (1-1..1-6) are displayed in a second display mode, if said combined navigation object (4) is selected, and wherein said respective target object that is displayed or executed upon selection of said respective navigation objects (1-11-6) is displayed or executed in said first display mode~~

Art Unit: 2179

(See column 15, lines 35-61).

With respect to **dependent claim 8**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said navigation objects ~~(1-1...1-6)~~ are defined according to a markup language, in particular the HyperText Markup Language ~~(HTML)~~ or derivatives thereof, and are interpreted by a browser (See column 6, lines 10-20).

With respect to **dependent claim 9**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said at least two navigation objects ~~(1-1...1-6)~~ are hyperlinks (See column 10, lines 5-16).

With respect to **dependent claim 10**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said first display mode is a scaled format display mode, and wherein said second display mode is an un-scaled format display mode (See column 16, lines 60-67 and column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67 and column 6, lines 52-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 12**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein in said first display mode, a first display window is used, and wherein in said second display mode, a second display window ~~(-8-)~~ is used (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 13**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein both said first and second display mode are used in the same display window (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45 and figures 11, 12 and 14).

With respect to **dependent claim 14**, Kanevsky teaches the method herein in said second display mode, at least one of a horizontal and a vertical scroll bar ~~(-7-)~~ is provided (Kanevsky column 16, lines 25-30).

With respect to **dependent claim 15**, Kanevsky teaches the method further comprising ~~the step-~~ of-determining whether said at least two navigation objects ~~(1-1...1-6)~~ have to be combined into one combined navigation object ~~(-4-)~~ or not (See column 8, lines 43-67).

Art Unit: 2179

In regard to claims **17, 25, 18 -19**, claims 17, 25, 18 -19 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 1, 5, and 15, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims **21-22**, claims 21-22 reflect the device comprising computer executable instruction used for performing the method steps as claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. Kanevsky expressly teaches the invention is utilized in a web environment which would include a browser (See figure 1, 101) and the computer readable medium to execute the steps of claim 1(See figure 2).

In regard to claims **23, 31-32**, claims 23, 31-32 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 26-28, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

With respect to **dependent claim 24**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects are merged into said combined graphical navigation object by scaling (See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65).

In regard to **Independent claim 26**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects, comprising: combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects, wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object, and wherein said combined navigation object is presentable and selectable to trigger presentation of said at least two navigation objects(Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon. Hyperlinks are graphical objects that

provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches that the elements can be configurable to allow multiple objects to be joined and triggered with the selection of a single icon as shown in figure 11 and 12.

With respect to **dependent claim 27**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects are merged into said combined graphical navigation object by scaling (See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 28**, Kanevsky teaches the method further comprising determining whether said at least two navigation objects have to be combined into one combined navigation object or not, wherein said determining is performed by a device (See column 8, lines 35-67 and column 7, line 40-55).

With respect to **dependent claim 30**, Kanevsky teaches the computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, the computer program comprising instructions operable to cause a processor to perform the method of claim 26 (See Figure 2 and column 5, lines 20-50).

In regard to **Independent claim 34**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects, comprising: receiving a combined navigation object obtained by combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects, and wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object, presenting said combined navigation object, and presenting said at least two navigation objects, if said combined navigation object is selected (Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon. Hyperlinks are graphical objects that provide for navigation of

Art Unit: 2179

content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches that the elements can be configurable to allow multiple objects to be joined and triggered with the selection of a single icon as shown in figure 11 and 12.

With respect to **dependent claim 35**, Kanevsky teaches method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects are merged into said combined graphical navigation object by scaling (See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 36**, Kanevsky teaches method wherein said combined navigation object is presented in a first display mode, and wherein said at least two navigation objects are displayed in a second display mode, if said combined navigation object is selected (See column 6, lines 50-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 37**, Kanevsky teaches method wherein said first display mode is a scaled format display mode, and wherein said second display mode is an un-scaled format display mode (See column 16, lines 60-67 and column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67 and column 6, lines 52-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 39**, Kanevsky teaches a computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, the computer program comprising instructions operable to cause a processor to perform the method of claim 34 (See figure 2 and column 5, lines 20-50).

In regard to claims **40-43**, claims 40-43 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 34-37, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001, in view of Carroll et al. (hereinafter Carroll) U.S. Patent No. 6154205 issued Nov. 28, 2000.**

With respect to **dependent claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44**, as indicated in the above discussion Kanevsky teaches each limitation of claims 1, 17, 23, 26, 34 and 40.

Kanevsky teaches the process of combining two navigational objects and scaling the objects and displaying them in an un-scaled or scaled state (See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65).

Kanevsky does not expressly teach the method wherein said at least two navigation objects are image hyperlinks within an image map contained in a web page, wherein said combined navigation object is represented by a selectable scaled graphical representation of said image map and wherein said image hyperlinks within said image map are displayed in un-scaled format, if said selectable graphical representation is selected.

However, in the same problem solving area Carroll teaches a system of displaying at least two navigational objects that are image hyperlinks in an image map within a web page for the purposes of making it easier for a user to select and navigate through web based content and to select objects on the screen (See column 1, lines 30-50 and column 2, lines 35-42). Carroll also teaches a process where the document may be larger than the display area, which is analogous to the situation in Kanevsky. Finally, Carroll teaches the hyperlink can be virtually any type of

Art Unit: 2179

object, which would include a combined object (See column 3, lines 55-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Carroll in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include an image map within the web page. The motivation to combine Kanevsky with Carroll comes from the suggestion in Carroll that any type of object can be displayed as an Icon (See column 3, lines 55-63 and column 6, lines 20-35) and that client side processing can include providing client side image maps contain selectable objects that are associated with hyperlinks, much like the associations made in Kanevsky.

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-10, 12-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

Art Unit: 2179

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBT



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER